

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1450 Alexascins, Virginia 22313-1450 www.emplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/042,658	01/08/2002	Brian Carl Stanz	021756-024600US	6991
51206 7550 1017/2008 TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW LLP TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER			EXAMINER	
			LERNER, MARTIN	
8TH FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	,		2626	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/17/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/042,658	STANZ ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
MARTIN LERNER	2626	

The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address	
THE REPLY FILED 13 October 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.	
1. All The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of the application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which place application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Require for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.14.7 he reply must be filed within one the following time.	he
periods;	
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection.	
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later, no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: if too x it is checked, check either box (6) or (f), ONLY CHECK BOX (6) WHEN THE FIRST REV. WAS FILED WITHIN T	
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).	
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension and have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension for under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely file may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.70(a)	ee as
NOTICE OF APPEAL	
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Sinc Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a). AMENDMENTS	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because	
(a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);	
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);	
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or	
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).	
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):	
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s)</li> </ol>	
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	
The status of the damits his (of will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:	
Claim(s) objected to:	
Claim(s) rejected:	
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary ar was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	ıd
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).	1
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	
11. \(\sumeq\) The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.	
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).	
13. Other:	
/Martin Lerner/	
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2626	

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Firstly, Applicants' arguments do not provide any additional clarity for the definiteness of "concurrently". Applicants say that concurrently means "at the same time", but Applicants' Specification does not disclose in what sense translation is concurrent with modification and development of the source text. Applicants' statement that the programmer may also be the translator, or that the programmer and the translator may be working side-by-side with each other, only adds to the confusion because neither of these embodiments is disclosed by the Specification.

Secondly, both Yamamoto et al. and Malcolm (903) disclose embodiments where translation is concurrent with modification and development of the source oode. Yamamoto et al. discloses a development cycle, where a testing phase reveals programming errors, and the software is shipped back for any necessary retranslation. Correction of a programming error must involve some modification of the source code. Thus, source code is modified concurrently with retranslation during a development cycle. Similarly, Malcolm (903) discloses that changes are common during a typical engineering/software development cycle. A set of screen panels sent to a translation center before the final code is completed. Here, the final code refers to the source code. Thus, any modification of the source code must be followed by retranslation at the translation center. Both of these instances involve "concurrent" changes to the source code and the translation for a concurrency is measured with respect to both occurring within the development cycle.